



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,243	10/01/2003	Vineet Kalucha	112097.132US1	3496
24395	7590	11/16/2006	EXAMINER	
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP 1875 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			AHN, SANGWOO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/675,243		KALUCHA ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Sangwoo Ahn		2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed on 8/17/2006 has been entered.

Claims 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20 have been amended.

Claim 21 has been added.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 8/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant mainly argued:

- Fliess is not related to “group collaboration through associative filing”.
- Fliess does not “associate at least one team having at least one member with the at least one project” and “display information characterizing the at least one project and the at least one team associated therewith”.
- Fliess does not disclose the step of “the project being assigned to one of a plurality of project types ... the project type assigned to the at least one project”.
- Fliess neither teaches nor suggests that “the users assigned as the at least one member of the at least one team being limited to the at least a portion of the plurality of users associated with the project type assigned to the at least one project”.
- Fliess neither teaches nor suggests “associating at least one functionality, task, job or role with the ... users”.
- Dewar does not teach “determining at least one keyword for at least one class”.

- There is no motivation to combine the teachings of Fliess and Dewar since Dewar neither discloses the need for determining keywords for the classes nor the need for associating a keyword with at least one class for at least one item.

Examiner respectfully submits that these arguments are not persuasive for the reasons stated below:

- Fliess clearly teaches or suggests "group collaboration through associative filling" in paragraph 55 lines 3 – 4 and 10. The project execution module can be used to manage project data, tasks and team collaboration, and support various project activities including sharing and collaboratively generating documents. From Fliess's disclosure, it seems apparent that associative filling of data or documents is present in the system.

- Fliess clearly teaches or suggests "associating at least one team having at least one member with the at least one project" in various places, particularly in paragraph 45 lines 5 – 6 as project administration tool and assignment engine, paragraph 53 lines 9 – 12 as team member collaboration within the content of project workspace, in paragraph 55 lines 7 – 9 as viewing team rosters and communicating with team members.

- Fliess clearly teaches or suggests "the project being assigned to one of a plurality of project types ... the project type assigned to the at least one project". First of all, Examiner would like to note that the recited limitation "project type" (or any of the remaining limitations that are broad, hence, this point applies to all grounds of rejections) can be interpreted as broadly as Examiner desires, as long as the interpretation is reasonable. From Figures 9 and 10, the "project type" could be the

therapeutic area or the project location. The “project type” can also be defined or classified according to the amount of money and resources spent for that particular project. Figure 14 also shows a plurality of “project types” in the graph, such as concept research, research project, development project, etc.

- As for the applicant's argument regarding “the users assigned as the at least one member of the at least one team being limited to the at least a portion of the plurality of users associated with the project type assigned to the at least one project”, Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claim presents in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Applicant does not explain how the present claim is patentably distinct or novel in view of the references discussed. In addition, Examiner still feels that these features are disclosed in Fliess.

- Fliess clearly teaches or suggests “associating at least one functionality, task, job or role with the ... users” in paragraph 45 lines 5 – 6, paragraph 53 lines 1 – 2, paragraph 55 lines 3 – 4, et seq.

- Dewar clearly teaches or suggests “determining at least one keyword for at least one class” in paragraph 98 and paragraph 100 lines 5 – 6 as entering a document category and class, and various other places in Dewar's disclosure.

- In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine references as to make the combination proper, Examiner respectfully submits that there are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references:

"Reason, suggestion, or motivation to combine two or more prior art references in single invention may come from references themselves, from knowledge of those skilled in art that certain references or disclosures in references are known to be of interest in particular field, or from nature of problem to be solved;" Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics Inc. U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 37 USPQ2d 1626 Decided February 7, 1996 Nos. 95-1171, - 1181.

Dewar's method of determining keywords would have enabled Fliess's overall system to reducing processing time by identifying resources efficiently and make project management tasks easier. The motivation for combination comes from references themselves and also from knowledge of those skilled in the art that disclosures in the references are known to be of interest in particular field.

In addition, Cobena and Bala belong to the analogous art of project management within business environment. There still could be a motivation to combine the two references so that the combination would result in an improved and enhanced version over the previous one, and because the two inventions are from the same field.

For the foregoing reasons, 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a) rejections still stand.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 – 16, and 18 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication Number 2004/0001103 issued to Kevin V. Fliess et al (hereinafter “Fliess”).

As per claim 1, Fliess discloses,

In a computer-implemented system, a method for group collaboration through associative filing (paragraph 55 lines 3 – 4 and 10, et seq.), in projects, of electronic information including at least one of structured and unstructured electronic data, documentation, and other information, cooperative with native applications that manipulate items comprising the electronic information (Figure 3: Enterprise Base Systems include various application services, Figure 4: Mail/File System, Figure 8: Word document and PowerPoint presentation links, et seq.), said group collaboration method comprising at least one of sequential, non-sequential, and sequence independent steps of:

- (A) storing at least one project of a plurality of projects, the project referencing a plurality of items (paragraph 37 lines 7 – 10, Figures 8 – 11, et seq.);
- (B) associating at least one team having at least one member with the at least one project (Figures 8 – 11: Project Manager leads a team of members, paragraph 45 lines 5 – 6, paragraph 53 lines 9 – 12, paragraph 55 lines 7 – 9, et seq.);
- (C) assigning at least one of a plurality of users as the at least one member of the at least one team (Figure 11: team assignment, Figure 18: Michelle Crow is the user and the member of the team, et seq.);

(D) storing the at least one team in association with the at least one project (Figures 8 – 11, and 18); and

(E) displaying information characterizing the at least one project and the at least one team associated therewith (Figures 8 – 11, and 18).

As per claim 2, Fliess discloses,

the project being assigned to one of a plurality of project types (Figures 9, 10, and 14, et seq.), each of the project types being associated with at least a portion of the plurality of users (associated with project manager), the users assigned as the at least one member of the at least one team being limited to the at least a portion of the plurality of users associated with the project type assigned to the at least one project.

As per claim 3, Fliess discloses,

associating at least one functionality, task, job or role with the at least one of the plurality of users assigned to the at least one team (Figure 18, paragraph 45 lines 5 – 6, paragraph 53 lines 1 – 2, paragraph 55 lines 3 – 4, et seq.).

As per claim 4, Fliess discloses,

the project being assigned to one of a plurality of project types (Figures 9, 10, and 14, et seq.), each functionality, task, job or role of each of the project types being associated with at least a portion of the plurality of users, the users assigned to the at least one functionality, task, job or role of the at least one team being limited to the at least a portion of the plurality of users associated with the at least one functionality, task, job or role of the project type assigned to the at least one project (Figure 18, et seq.).

As per claim 5, Fliess discloses,
redefining the at least one member assigned to the at least one team, wherein redefining further comprises at least one of: removing at least one user from the at least one team, assigning at least one user as the at least one member of the at least one team, and reassigning at least one user in at least one functionality, task, job or role associated with the at least one team (Figure 10 element 1030, Figure 11).

As per claim 6, Fliess discloses,
the at least one functionality, task, job or role includes at least one of: a project team member, an internal team member, an external team member, a project owner, and a user-defined role (Figure 18, et seq.).

As per claim 7, Fliess discloses,
redefining the at least one member assigned to the at least one team (Figure 10 element 1030, Figure 11, et seq.).

As per claim 8, Fliess discloses,
the plurality of users are selected from items in cooperation with at least one native application associated therewith to provide contact information for at least a portion of the plurality of users (Figure 11 element 1150, et seq.).

As per claim 9, Fliess discloses,
the native application includes at least one of: e-mail and an address book (Figure 8: Word and PowerPoint file links indicate native application associated therewith, Figure 11: Profile could be a part of an address book, et seq.).

As per claim 10, Fliess discloses,

at least one of selecting a project and listing the plurality of items in the project (Figure 8: a project has been selected and a list of Word and PowerPoint files is shown as a list of items, et seq.), and responsive to a selection of at least one of the plurality of items, displaying information characterizing the item, via a native application cooperating therewith (Figure 8: Links to Word and PowerPoint files lead to Word/PowerPoint interface, et seq.).

As per claim 11, Fliess discloses,
the at least one user being associated with a plurality of teams on a plurality of projects (Figure 18, et seq.).

As per claim 12, Fliess discloses,
transmitting a message to at least a portion of the at least one member associated with the at least one project (Figure 18: Alerts & Notifications, et seq.).

As per claim 13, Fliess discloses,
notifying at least a portion of the users assigned to the at least one team of changes to the at least one project associated with the at least one team (Figure 18: Alerts & Notifications, et seq.).

As per claim 14, Fliess discloses,
the at least one item is one of: a communication, a document, a transaction, an e-mail, a task, a meeting, a contact, a message, an image, music, electronic Notes, video, a multimedia file, an other native application content, and a project (Figure 8: Word and PowerPoint document/file, et seq.).

As per claim 15, Fliess discloses,

the document is at least one of: a text document, an image document, a resolved universal resource locator (URL), a bitmap document, and a digitized document (Figure 8: Word document, et seq.).

As per claim 16, Fliess discloses,

the at least one native application includes at least one of: messaging and collaboration application, presentation graphics application, spreadsheet application, word processing application, graphical file management application graphical web browser, portable document converter and reader, and file archiver and compressor; wherein a user interface for the at least one native application includes an extension to act on items and help information for acting on items; and wherein a toolbar for the at least one native application includes an extension to act on items (Figure 8: Links to Word and PowerPoint files lead to Word/PowerPoint interface, et seq.).

As per claim 18, Fliess discloses,

In a computer-implemented system, a method for group collaboration through associative filing (paragraph 55 lines 3 – 4 and 10, et seq.), in project, of electronic information including at least one of structured and unstructured electronic data, documentation, and other information, cooperative with native applications that manipulates items comprising the electronic information (Figure 3: Enterprise Base Systems include various application services, Figure 4: Mail/File System, Figure 8: Word document and PowerPoint presentation links, et seq.), said group collaboration method comprising at least one of the sequential, non-sequential, and sequence independent steps of:

(A) storing at least one project of a plurality of projects, the project referencing a plurality of items, the project being assigned to one of a plurality of project types, and each of the project types being associated with at least a portion of a plurality of users (paragraph 37 lines 7 – 10, Figures 8 – 11, 14, and 18);

(B) associating at least one team having at least one member with the at least one project (Figures 8 – 11: Project Manager leads a team of members, paragraph 45 lines 5 – 6, paragraph 53 lines 9 – 12, paragraph 55 lines 7 – 9, et seq.);

(C) assigning at least one of the plurality of users as the at least one member of the at least one team, the users assigned as members of the at least one team being limited to the at least a portion of the plurality of users associated with the project type assigned to the at least one project (Figures 8 and 10, et seq.);

(D) storing the at least one item in association with the at least one project (Figure 10: Attachments);

(E) displaying information characterizing the at least one project and the at least one team associated therewith (Figure 8, et seq.);

(F) redefining the at least one member assigned to the at least one team (Figures 10 and 11: Assign); and

(G) at least one of selecting a project and listing the plurality of items in the project (Figure 8: a project has been selected and a list of Word and PowerPoint files is shown as a list of items, et seq.), and responsive to a selection of at least one of the plurality of items, displaying information characterizing the item, via a native application

cooperating therewith (Figure 8: Links to Word and PowerPoint files lead to Word/PowerPoint interface, et seq.).

Claims 19 and 20 are essentially the same as claim 18 except they set forth the limitations as “a system” and “a computer-readable medium”, rather than “a method”. Therefore, claims 19 and 20 are rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claim 18 rejection.

As per claim 21, Fliess discloses,

In a computer-implemented system, a method for group collaboration through associative filing (paragraph 55 lines 3 – 4 and 10, et seq.), in projects, of electronic information including at least one of structured and unstructured electronic data, documentation, and other information, cooperative with native applications that manipulate items comprising the electronic information (Figure 3: Enterprise Base Systems include various application services, Figure 4: Mail/File System, Figure 8: Word document and PowerPoint presentation links, et seq.), said group collaboration method comprising at least one of the sequential, non-sequential, and sequence independent steps of:

(A) storing at least one project of a plurality of projects, the project referencing a plurality of items, the project being assigned to one of a plurality of project types, and each of the project types being associated with at least a portion of a plurality of users (paragraph 37 lines 7 – 10, Figures 8 – 11, 14, and 18);

Art Unit: 2166

(B) associating at least one team having at least one member with the at least one project (Figures 8 – 11: Project Manager leads a team of members, paragraph 45 lines 5 – 6, paragraph 53 lines 9 – 12, paragraph 55 lines 7 – 9, et seq.);

(C) assigning at least one of the plurality of users as the at least one member of the at least one team (Figures 8 and 10, et seq.);

(D) storing the at least one item in association with the at least one project (Figure 10: Attachments);

(E) displaying information characterizing the at least one project and the at least one team associated therewith (Figure 8, et seq.);

(F) removing at least one user from the at least one team, assigning at least one user as the at least one member of the at least one team (Figure 11, paragraph 45 lines 4 – 6, paragraph 53 lines 1 – 4, paragraph 55 line 12, et seq.); and

(G) reassigning at least one user in at least one functionality, task, job or role associated with the at least one team (Figure 11, paragraph 45 lines 4 – 6, paragraph 53 lines 1 – 4, paragraph 55 line 12, et seq.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fliess in view of International Publication Number WO 99/22321 issued to Gregory John Dewar (hereinafter "Dewar").

As per claim 17, Fliess discloses,

the at least one project is assigned to one of a plurality of project types, wherein at least two items of the plurality of items have different corresponding native applications; associating the at least one item with the at least one project, displaying information characterizing the at least one project and the at least one item associated therewith, selecting the at least one item thereof and opening the at least one item in the native application corresponding thereto (Figure 8, et seq. (discussed in detail under claim 18 rejection)).

Fliess does not explicitly disclose a plurality of classes are associated with a plurality of items and at least one keyword is determined for at least one class, the determined at least one keyword is associated with the at least one class for at least one item.

However, Dewar discloses a plurality of classes are associated with a plurality of items (page 2 line 22, et seq.) and at least one keyword is determined for at least one class, the determined at least one keyword is associated with the at least one class for at least one item (Figure 5, page 3 lines 6 – 14, paragraph 98 and paragraph 100 lines 5 – 6, et seq.). It would have been obvious to combine the two references because Dewar's keyword assignment would have enabled Fliess system to provide search capabilities and means for linking information and tasks related to each project (filing

arrangement under relevant information classes) as indicated by Dewar in his disclosure. Additionally, the combination of the two would have enabled the overall system to invoke an appropriate application program when an item in an information class is to be created or selected.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sangwoo Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-5626. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571)272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11/8/2006 SW

Sangwoo Ahn
Patent Examiner AU 2166



HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER